

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 35-45 are pending in the application, with 35 and 40 being the independent claims. Claims 33 and 34 are sought to be canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 35-45 are sought to be added. Support for new claims 35-45 is found in the specification, *inter alia*, at page 6, line 31 to page 7, line 8 and page 10, lines 24-28, combining the disclosed concentrations and a volume of 1.8 ml, and in the claims as originally filed. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statements

Applicants note that the Examiner has returned an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form submitted with the First Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed May 9, 2005, but did not initial next to document AK1 (U.S. Patent No. 5,236,904). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner return another copy of the PTO-1449 form indicating that this document has been considered.

Applicants further note that an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form submitted with the Fourth Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement electronically filed December 19, 2006 has not been returned. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner return a copy of the PTO-1449 form indicating that the cited documents have been considered.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 33 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Grenfell *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,416,323) in view of Wattsmith (Derwent Acc. No. 1985-277771, abstract). (Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner is of the opinion that Grenfell *et al.* teach a dental cartridge that fits into a standard dental local anesthetic syringe, that Wattsmith teaches the use of phentolamine or its salts to improve local anesthesia for dentistry or oral surgery, and that it would have been obvious to put phentolamine mesylate into the syringe of Grenfell *et al.* (Office Action, pages 2-3).

Applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 33 and 34 have been canceled, rendering the rejection moot. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Insofar as the cited documents may be cited against the new claims, the following comments are provided. The new claims are directed to a dental cartridge containing a composition comprising about 0.0018 mg and about 0.45 mg phentolamine mesylate or a

molar equivalent of another alpha adrenergic receptor antagonist (claim 35) or containing a composition comprising an alpha adrenergic receptor antagonist at a concentration of from about 0.001 mg/mL to about 0.25 mg/mL (claim 40). Wattsmith discloses the use of phentolamine mesylate and other alpha adrenergic receptor antagonists to reduce the prolongation of anesthesia. However, Wattsmith is silent regarding the levels of antagonist to use. In particular, Wattsmith fails to teach or suggest the low concentrations and low doses present in the claimed cartridges, which Applicants have unexpectedly shown to be effective to reverse anesthesia. Grenfell *et al.* does not make up for the deficiencies of Wattsmith as Grenfell *et al.* do not disclose anything about compositions to be administered in their disclosed syringe. Thus, the present claims cannot be obvious over the cite references.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert A. Schwartzman, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,211

Date: May 14, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
674249_1.DOC